

### **REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action, dated November 16, 2004, in the above referenced pending application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the below remarks and withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Response to Restriction Requirement**

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the invention of Group I, Species 2 (Claims 2 to 26), drawn to a method including discreet wells in sets of three to define a subpixel.

### **Status of the claims**

Claims 1 and 27-34 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 2-26 are pending.

Claims 7 and 17 have been amended to correct grammatical errors. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 10, 23 and 24 have been amended to properly refer to the unpatterned organic layer 70 that may be deposited prior to deposition of the cathode 60. *See* the pending application at page 7, lines 17-23 and at page 11, line 28 to page 12, line 2. No new matter is introduced.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e): Claims 2-26**

Claims 2-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,656,519 to Sakaguchi et al (the '519 patent). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reason that Sakaguchi, the '519 patent, does not teach every element as set forth in the claims recited above.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 2, the '519 patent does not teach a method for producing a full color, subpixellated organic electroluminescent (EL) device comprising establishing a plurality of discreet wells in sets of three, wherein said discreet wells are formed by circumscribing walls to form said wells. Item 4a in the '519 patent, referenced in the Office Action, is an organic luminescent layer (containing a dopant), and not a discreet well formed by circumscribing walls to form said wells as recited in the claim. *See* the '519 patent FIG.1 and at column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 1. Further, the '519 patent does not teach or suggest depositing a buffer layer onto the anode layer in each of said wells. Item 6 in the '519 patent is an electron transport layer that is formed on the organic luminescent layer 4 and not the anode 2. *See* the '519 patent FIG. 1 and at column 4, lines 32-44. Further still, the '519 patent does not teach depositing an unpatterned EL host polymer layer selected to produce blue light in each of said wells. Item 14B in the '519 patent is indeed a blue luminescent layer, but it is patterned by using mask 8 to vapor deposit 1,4-

distyrylbenzene (or alternatively tris (8-hydroxyquinoline) aluminum (host) and perylene (dopant)) into the blue subpixels only. See the '519 patent FIG. 3 and at column 6, lines 16-24. The blue luminescent layer of the '519 patent is not *unpatterned* and is not a *polymer*.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 3-26, Claims 3-26 are dependent claims of Claim 2, and for the reasons stated above, the '519 patent does not teach or suggest the element recited in Claims 3-26. Thus, the above referenced rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance of Claims 2-26 is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



MARY ANN CAPRIA  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Registration No.: 32,659

Telephone: (302) 992-3749

Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: 1.24.2005